

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated October 18, 2005, the Office rejected claims 1-4, 12, 13, 17-19 and 32 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Section 102 over the reference to Rodriguez Barros et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,926,432.

Still further, the Office indicated that claims 5-11, 14-16 and 20-31 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 5 has been amended consistent with the indication of allowable subject matter as indicated above. Claim 6-11 depend from claim 5 and therefore are also believed to be allowable. Favorable action with respect to same is courteously solicited in the Office's next action.

Claim 19 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 20, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to allowable subject matter with respect to claims 20-31, it is believed that claims 19 and 21-31 are now allowable. The Office will note that claims 18 and 20 are hereby cancelled.

The Office has requested corrected drawings. However, in view of the cancellation of claim 20, and the amendments as made to claim 19, it is believed that this requirement has now been obviated. Favorable action with respect to the drawings as originally filed is requested in the Office's next action.

For similar reasons, the objections to the specification also appear to be obviated. Favorable consideration of the specification is requested in the Office's next action.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 over the reference to Barros, U.S. Patent No. 6,926,432. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4, 12 and 17 as variously amended are not anticipated by the Barros reference.

It is hornbook law that in order to render a claim anticipated by a prior art reference, each and every element of the claimed subject matter must be found in that reference.

The Office has provided a rather thorough analysis of the Barros reference, but has failed to identify one element from claim 1 which is not found in the Barros reference. More specifically, claim 1 as originally filed, and which is now amended, claimed an electromagnetic radiation emitter for emitting visibly discernible electromagnetic radiation and which is borne by the second surface of the reflective substrate [Emphasis added]. The reflective substrate as identified in the Barros reference, U.S. Patent No. 6,926,432 is identified by the numeral 50. The Office will note, by reviewing the 103 sheets of drawings in that patent that nowhere in any of the drawings, or in the specification is there a suggestion or teaching that any of the light emitting diodes or other emitters of Barros should be mounted on the second surface, that is, the inwardly facing surface of the mirror 50. In view of the absence of this element as called for in claim 1, in the Barros reference, it is Applicants' respectful contention that the Barros reference does not anticipate, or in the alternative, render obvious the present invention as claimed in claims 1-4, as presently amended. Consequently, favorable action with respect to amended claims 1-4 is respectfully requested in the Office's next action.

Referring now to originally filed claim 12. Again, the Barros reference as cited in the Office Action does not disclose an electromagnetic radiation emitter mounted on the second surface of the reflective substrate as called for in this claim. In view of the absence of this element as called for in this claim in this reference, it is respectfully suggested that the Barros reference does not anticipate same. Further, and contrary to the Office's contention, there is no light channeling assembly disposed, at least in part, against the sidewall of the housing and which reflects the first portion of the visibly discernible

electromagnetic radiation through the gap which is defined between the sidewall and the reflective substrate [Emphasis added]. For these reasons, it is believed that claim 12 and those claims depending therefrom, are allowable over the art of record.

With respect to claim 17, the Barros reference does not anticipate same because Barros does not teach or suggest an electromagnetic emitter borne by the reflective substrate, nor an assembly which produces visibly discernable electromagnetic radiation which passes around the peripheral edge of the reflective substrate to form a visibly discernable signal. In view of this, it is believed that claim 17 is allowable over the art of record.

In view of the foregoing, it would appear that this application is now in condition for allowance and a prompt Notice of Allowance of claims 1-17, 19 and 21-32 is courteously requested in the Office's next action.

Applicant, by and through their counsel, would request that the Office telephone the attorneys in the event that a further telephone conference could expedite the prompt handling of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

ALLEN A. BUKOSKY et al.

Dated: 11 Jan 2006

By:

George G. Grigel
Reg. No. 31,166